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“It’s the Community That We’ve Made”: Jewish Migration to East Lansing, Michigan, in the Postwar Era

by Kirsten Fermaglich

In 1967, David and Beverly Wiener and their two daughters left their supportive graduate student housing community in Syracuse, New York and arrived in East Lansing, Michigan, ready for David to start his new job as an assistant professor in the American Thought and Language program at Michigan State University. David was born in Philadelphia, grew up in a Jewish neighborhood there, and his entire tight-knit family had gone to school in the Philadelphia area. His mother was deeply upset with David’s decision to take a job halfway across the country. But at least one fellow graduate of Syracuse assured him that he wouldn’t stay long at MSU; he could stay for a few years and then move elsewhere.¹

David and Bev, however, have remained in East Lansing for over fifty years. David enjoyed his work at the university at first, and they found themselves making friends easily, joining two communities that would become central to their lives in Michigan, in some ways substituting for their close families and communities on the East Coast. The first community was political: they made friends with liberals of many different religious backgrounds, forming a young liberal group that called for the desegregation of East Lansing, and took other steps towards racial and class equality in the Lansing area. That community became formative in David’s professional identity, and ultimately gave him an alternative career path: he left academia for politics in the late 1970s, and worked for his friend, Lansing mayor David Hollister, for twenty years.²
The second community was a group of young Jewish families who had almost all come to East Lansing to work at MSU or Lansing Community College. They celebrated Jewish holidays together, created new rituals, and established a Hebrew school for their children, called Rishon. They developed different pathways for their children to become *b'nai mitzvot*; David and Bev’s older daughter Rebecca presented research on Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe, while their younger daughter Susan wanted a more traditional bat mitzvah, requiring the group to find a Torah. And they became a part of the larger religious landscape of the capital area of Michigan. The members of Rishon—including David and Bev—ultimately joined some disaffected, mostly academic, members of the only synagogue in town at the time, Shaarey Zedek, to form a new congregation, Kehillat Israel (KI). Without a rabbi for years, KI functioned as a small, tight-knit community, with roughly two-thirds of its initial congregation made up of academic families. Members taught one another how to lead services and created innovative programs to teach their children Jewish ritual and liturgy. With a tiny Jewish population and only one extant Jewish institution in mid-Michigan before 1970, young Jewish academic families like the Wieners forged their own Jewish community.

David and Bev found themselves embracing Michigan, learning to love camping and the scenery of the Midwest and uncovering both the Jewish and the non-Jewish beauties of the state. While some East Coast friends complained about Michigan’s flat, boring landscape and homogeneous food culture, David found himself appreciating its beauty and diversity. Travelling back home from Detroit one night, after eating corned beef sandwiches at the Stage Deli, David remembered thinking, “you know, this is a gorgeous place, with these beautiful skies. And I said, it’s so big that these hills are just kind of flattened out. So, you could think of them as mountains, only they got flattened out. So, it’s just a matter of perspective.”

The Wieners’ story in East Lansing is part of a larger pattern of the post-World War II era that has rarely been studied or even acknowledged by historians. As higher education boomed and restrictions on Jews in academia lifted, the years after World War II saw thousands of young Jews from Jewish neighborhoods in big cities, mostly on the coasts, going to graduate school and then finding jobs in higher education in college towns and small cities throughout the country. Few scholars have identified this movement as a significant wave of internal migration within the United States. American Jewish historians have been preoccupied with other larger, more visible migration patterns, particularly the mass migration of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe in
the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While many scholars today argue that the study of immigration should be reconsidered as a study of migration, and that there is an important relationship between migration within a state and migration between states, American Jewish historians have typically focused on immigration and paid less attention to internal migration.6

There have been several important studies of Jewish internal migration within the United States, but they have primarily highlighted the expansion of Jewish peddlers and traders across the United States during the nineteenth century. Both Hasia Diner’s recent work on peddlers and Shari Rabin’s exploration of Jews on the frontier offer crucial insights about the significance of mobility and transience in the formation of Jewish identity and community in America. Much like David and Bev Wieners’ experience in twentieth-century East Lansing, peddlers like M.S. Polack on the nineteenth century frontier found themselves in locations with few Jews, using creativity and flexibility to devise new rituals and build community.7

Historians like Lila Corwin Berman and Deborah Dash Moore have looked at internal migration in the twentieth century through two major migration movements after World War II—Jewish suburbanization and Sunbelt migration—and they too have offered significant insight into the experiences of academic Jews during this era. Berman has noted the significance of place in American Jewish life, as Jews migrated to suburbs but continued to identify themselves with the city. Meanwhile, Moore has described the frontier-like spirit of Jews moving to the cities of Miami and Los Angeles, building institutions that promoted experiential and egalitarian education.8 As we will see in this article, the Jews of East Lansing similarly prized experiential learning and egalitarianism. Unlike in Miami and Los Angeles, however, no mass migration of Jews arrived in the capital area of Michigan in the years after World War II. There were few attractions to mid-Michigan—either in its climate or its economy—that encouraged the chain migrations of Sunbelt communities like Miami or Los Angeles. Without that critical mass, Lansing Jews attracted no handsome, dynamic, entrepreneurial leaders, like those who travelled to Miami and Los Angeles seeking new pulpits to shape in their own image. Academic Jews also no longer lived near their families, as did suburban Jews, who might have lived only a fifteen-minute drive away from their parents and grandparents and still found themselves politically and culturally tied to the city of their childhood. By contrast, in their new college towns hundreds of miles from their former communities and far from their parents and grandparents, academic Jews found themselves identifying less with the cities and communities
of their origins and instead seeking a new Jewish family and community and constructing a new Jewish identity.

Several historians have documented the impact of this influx of Jewish academics within the intellectual life of their various disciplines. And indeed, for many academics, that impact was crucial: in East Lansing, numerous Jewish scholars found themselves making a mark in their disciplines, like sociology, education, and history. But few scholars have analyzed the social impact of this migration for Jews themselves or their communities. Community leaders in the 1960s and 1970s were indeed quite worried that the move into academia would separate young ambitious, intellectual Jews from the Jewish community, but no historians have identified or addressed this anxiety, or the actual experiences of these academic Jews after they moved.

Although my research is only in its beginning stages, oral histories of academics (and family members) born between 1931 and 1956 who moved to East Lansing in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, and synagogue documents from Congregation Kehillat Israel suggest that the experience of migration to a small college town with few Jews, like East Lansing, during an era of religious experimentation and educational boom actually intensified and made more meaningful the Jewish identities of many Jewish academic migrants. Jewish academic families who moved to East Lansing in the 1960s and 1970 participated in the religious experimentation of the era’s Jewish counterculture, as did many other Jewish men and women in New York, Los Angeles, and other large cities, but that religious experimentation took on very different meaning for Jewish men and women who had moved across the country from their families to a profoundly non-Jewish environment, one very different from the one they had experienced as children.

BACKGROUNDS
Most of the Jews who moved to East Lansing in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s to work in education grew up in heavily Jewish neighborhoods in cities and suburbs on the coasts (both New York and California) or in the Midwest (Chicago, Cleveland or Detroit). Ken Glickman remembered his Cleveland Heights neighborhood being “very rich” in Jewish culture. Marcia Horan estimated that her Lincolnwood suburban neighborhood just outside of Chicago was about eighty to eighty-five percent Jewish. Paul Menchik remembered
of growing up in Crown Heights, Brooklyn: “I didn’t really know a white Christian until I went to college. It was very much cloistered.”\textsuperscript{14} Emily Tabuteau remembered only two families that she believed were non-Jewish from her entire Prospect Heights, Brooklyn neighborhood.\textsuperscript{15} And in the Fairfax neighborhood of Los Angeles, where Don Kaufman spent his early childhood, he joked that on Jewish holidays, the local high school held classes in the phone booth.\textsuperscript{16}

A number of migrants remembered streets studded with synagogues and shuls, shopping districts laden with Jewish delis and kosher markets, and neighborhood kids who “roamed the streets,” sometimes stopping traffic for play.\textsuperscript{17} As children, their neighborhood friends tended to be Jewish, as were their elementary school friends. Some Jewish migrants made close friendships through their synagogues or youth groups, which were deeply embedded in the fabric of their neighborhoods and family lives.\textsuperscript{18} For others, it was extended family that dominated social life. Most grew up with grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins living in the same neighborhood or nearby; several spent their weekends, holidays, and hours after school playing with cousins, and participating in large family get-togethers regularly.\textsuperscript{19}

As they travelled through middle school and high school, they sometimes remembered branching out and making non-Jewish friends. Rich Block lived in a predominantly Jewish neighborhood in Chicago growing up, but he remembered that his position on the high school football team helped him make non-Jewish friends for the first time, an experience of being a minority that had a lasting impact on him. His wife, Marcia Horan, purposely applied for a year-long program in urban studies at a predominantly African American high school in Chicago to reach out to non-Jews and non-whites as a high school student. Karen Glickman’s best friend in high school in Cleveland Heights was the daughter of a Methodist minister; Steve Yelon remembered one of his best friends, Jimmy Thompson, inviting him over to decorate his Christmas tree and play with his Christmas presents.\textsuperscript{20}

But to a large extent, it was Jewish family, neighbors, and friends that governed the early social lives of most of these young Jewish men and women. And it was Jewish institutions—from Orthodox shuls around the block to B’nai B’rith youth organizations to Boy Scout troops to kosher butchers—that formed the backdrop for these friendships and relationships. Beverly Wiener remembered that although she was not at all observant religiously, she regularly attended Saturday morning services at her Conservative synagogue in Rochester because they fit seamlessly into her extracurricular and social schedule: “I was in inter-high band at 8:00 and inter-high orchestra at 9:00 and at 10:00 I could
walk over to the Conservative synagogue and join the junior congregation for the last part and then we would move to the regular congregation for the last part of the [services] and then we had tea and coffee and cookies and then I would go with a friend to a movie.”21 Art Seagull’s mother desperately wanted him to become a rabbi at one of the synagogues in their Weequahic neighborhood in Newark, NJ—though not the local Orthodox shul they attended, where he was the leader of the Zionist youth group.22 Marcia Horan’s parents worked at a large Reform synagogue in Chicago—her mother was the religious school principal and her father was the director of the children’s choir—and so she lived her life at the synagogue: “I thought I ran the place.” She also became deeply involved in her synagogue’s branch of the Chicago Federation of Temple Youth (CFTY).23 David Wiener remembered participating actively in his synagogue’s Jewish youth group all through high school, with Friday night services and Saturday night dances: “it was the center of our community.”24

Yet, for many other Jews, those institutions were just part of the backdrop: many took being Jewish for granted, never went to Shabbat services as children, and avoided youth groups. In Paul Menchik’s neighborhood, “It was the exception, not the rule, to be a regular synagogue-goer.”25 Marcia Horan remembered that very few of her neighborhood friends went to services the way that her family did: “You didn’t really have to be [observant]. Everybody did Passover, everybody did Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur. Everything closed down in my neighborhood. . . . If you grow up in a Jewish neighborhood, you know, Christmas didn’t even creep in. It’s kind of irrelevant.”26 Lisa Fine noted: “In my view, Jewishness was background noise because it was so ubiquitous, you didn’t pay attention to it.”27 Out of her eight closest girlfriends in Brooklyn, Emily Tabuteau remembered, seven were Jewish, but none of their families went to synagogue.28 Indeed, Jewish institutions, friends, and family in Jewish neighborhoods enabled many Jews who would eventually migrate to East Lansing to develop Jewish identities as children that had nothing to do with the practice of the religion itself, a pattern that Jonathan Sarna and others have noted was typical for American Jewish neighborhoods in the first half of the twentieth century.29

And it is worth noting that Jewish institutions frequently shaped young Jews’ lives, even when their families were not actually members of those institutions, or even residents of the neighborhood anymore. Several Jewish men, like Stan Kaplowitz and Paul Menchik, went to Orthodox shuls in the neighborhood for their religious education or bar mitzvah ceremonies, even though their immediate families did not attend services or belong to those shuls.30
Steve Yelon’s family lived in a neighborhood with multiple synagogues with famous cantors and although the family were not frequent synagogue-goers, they would sometimes stand outside the synagogues, “just to listen [to the cantors], especially in the warm weather. They would crank the windows open and we would listen in. . . . They were amazing.” Lisa Fine remembered that even when her family left the Jewish neighborhood of Borough Park, they kept returning to go shopping at Jewish stores, especially to buy the deli specialties they couldn’t find in the new neighborhood. And Paul Menchik remembered adults walking to shul in his neighborhood on Friday nights, and Lubavitcher kids from a nearby Hasidic enclave playing punchball in his schoolyard, even though he did not grow up with this level of Orthodoxy.

Indeed, these men and women were raised with a wide range of denominational backgrounds. Stan Kaplowitz and Emily Tabuteau grew up in secular leftist homes; Kaplowitz attended a secular Yiddish shul for religious education. David Wiener’s family were early supporters of Mordecai Kaplan and the Reconstructionist ideal. Marcia Horan’s family was deeply enmeshed in the Reform movement. Marcia Horan attended large Conservative synagogues. Karen and Ken Glickman both attended large Conservative synagogues. And others described homes that might be called traditional, somewhere between Conservative and Orthodox: their parents might keep kosher at home, but not in restaurants; their grandparents might take them to Orthodox shuls on Saturday morning but their parents never went to services and joined the Conservative synagogue because it had more child-friendly Sunday school. For most, denomination was loose and less meaningful than the fact of Jewishness itself.

Camp was another Jewish institution that shaped many of these Jewish men and women’s childhoods. Some of the camps were denominational, though others were not: Marcia Horan attended the Olin Sang Ruby Institute, a Reform-affiliated camp, while Steve Yelon went to an unaffiliated camp that was nonetheless predominantly Jewish, with Friday night services. Several, including Arthur Elstein, Josef Konvitz, and David Wiener, attended Camp Ramah, affiliated with the Conservative movement. Still others, like Bev Wiener and Ruth and Arthur Seagull, worked as counselors at Jewish camps. These camp experiences were important in many of these men and women’s childhoods. They made close friendships, learned ritual and songs, and developed confidence in their athletic and leadership abilities. As intended by their founders, this immersion in a Jewish space with Jewish songs, rituals and friends made a deep impression on many migrants: “That was a very important part of my upbringing,” Steve Yelon remembered, “I had a lot of friends from
that. They had nothing to do with Yeshiva. They had nothing to do with high school. But it was a completely different group, all Jewish.”

Lest this portrait seem overly nostalgic, it is worth noting that quite a few migrants—particularly women—did not have particularly fond or rosy memories of their Jewish neighborhoods or communities at all. A number of people, like Marcia Horan, Toba Kaplowitz, and Lisa Fine, saw their overwhelmingly Jewish high schools as overly materialistic, shallow, intolerant, and homogeneous. Indeed, Lisa Fine found herself out of step with high school social circles because she looked “too white bread”: not Jewish enough. While most male migrants interviewed seem to have had an easier time finding friends in their neighborhoods and schools through shared experiences, women may have faced a higher bar for behavior and looks in their overwhelmingly Jewish worlds. And to be sure, by the 1960s, many young Jews, both men and women, were becoming critical of their Jewish communities, synagogues, and families, seeing them dominated by wealth and hypocrisy. The Jews who eventually moved to East Lansing did not all share this critique, but some certainly did.

It is important to note that the Jewish migrants interviewed were not all grounded exclusively in Jewish neighborhoods or in Jewish communities as children. In addition to their experiences in Jewish neighborhoods, some migrants had experiences in more mixed neighborhoods, like Boyle Heights in Los Angeles or Midwood Park in Brooklyn, where Jews lived together with Italian Catholics, Latinos, African Americans, and Arab Americans. Perhaps even more importantly, other Jewish migrants had very different, less urban and less Jewish experiences growing up. Fran Yelon grew up in Alton, Illinois, a small city with few Jews and one synagogue with a travelling rabbi. A few faculty children, like Josef Konvitz and Judy Bisno Shulman, grew up themselves in academic communities with few Jews; their parents were part of a first wave of Jewish academics who got jobs in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Still others grew up Christian and converted to Judaism later in life. Bettie Menchik’s great-grandparents had been Jewish, but she was raised a committed Unitarian in the New York suburbs, and decided to convert only after she and Paul got married. Liz Kaufman was raised by parents who were nominally Protestant and went to Presbyterian Sunday school in Salt Lake City; she became committed to Jewish practice and community when she and Don Kaufman began dating, but she didn’t convert until much later in life.

Migrating Jews thus came to East Lansing from a wide variety of locations, with a wide variety of experiences, but the majority had formative experiences in large Jewish urban and suburban neighborhoods of the 1930s, 1940s
and 1950s that were notably similar. These experiences reflected an era when dense urban Jewish neighborhoods in the United States promoted a Jewish cultural identity mostly detached from significant religious practice and grounded in geography, institutional proximity, food, family and friendship networks. The vast majority of the men and women who would ultimately migrate to East Lansing were affected by this secular urban Jewish identity, either as part of their own experiences, or as a product of their spouses’ experiences.

MOVING TO EAST LANSING
After a decade or so of college and graduate school life, where they typically engaged little in organized Jewish life and focused on education, career, and getting married, rather than any kind of Jewish religious or communal experiences, these men and women found themselves moving to East Lansing, Michigan—overwhelmingly because they or their partners had jobs at Michigan State University.

Most of them had experience in the Midwest before moving to East Lansing. Many, of course, were from Midwestern cities like Cleveland or Chicago. Others brought up on the coasts had gone to college or graduate school in the Midwest, especially to the University of Michigan and University of Wisconsin. The Midwest, and even Michigan, was not new for most of them.

But even many with significant experience in the Midwest paused when moving to East Lansing. East Lansing is part of the larger metropolitan area of Lansing, the capital of Michigan, and in the years after World War II, its population was booming, in part because of the national expansion of higher education, and specifically the growth of MSU, during this era. Nonetheless, in comparison to the major cities from which almost all of these men and women hailed, like Los Angeles, Cleveland, Chicago, and New York, the Capital area was tiny: in 1970, the combined population of East Lansing and Lansing was 178,943.51

And beyond its small size, Lansing was not an especially diverse city. Even the auto manufacturer centered in Lansing, the R. E. Olds Company, had historically hired its workers from surrounding white rural areas, rather than seeking out immigrant or Black workers, as had the Big Three centered in Detroit. Olds’ goal was to preserve the homogeneity of its workforce and to discourage unionization, but the practice laid a foundation for a Capital area
population that lacked ethnic and racial diversity.\textsuperscript{52} Jews were a tiny minority in the overwhelmingly Christian city: in 1918, the Jewish population of Lansing was 450 out of about 57,000, only the sixth largest Jewish population in the state.\textsuperscript{53} Forty years later, there were many more Jews in the mid-Michigan area, but they still remained a small proportion of the growing Capital-area region. In 1957, 350 Jewish families (perhaps between 1,000 and 2,000 people) were members of the only synagogue in town, Shaarey Zedek, while the Lansing population in 1960 was over 100,000.\textsuperscript{54}

And perhaps surprisingly, the presence of Michigan State University did little to broaden this ethnic diversity in the 1960s and 1970s. Although similar state colleges that migrants were familiar with—particularly the Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin—had historically attracted a significant Jewish population and encouraged cosmopolitan college town environments, Michigan State's origins as an insular agricultural college shaped the culture of East Lansing, making it less of a typical college town with restaurants, theater, and other urban amenities. Stan Kaplowitz, for example, remembered that when he was an undergraduate, “people at U of M felt superior to MSU, which was called ‘Moo-U’ because of its agricultural college origins,” while he was told that people at MSU “referred to U of M as ‘Jew U’ because of its large number of Jews.”\textsuperscript{55}

A good number of migrants admitted to feeling alienated by the lack of cosmopolitanism and diversity, and particularly the lack of a Jewish community, when they got their jobs and first arrived in Lansing. “We came to East Lansing and it was so different from Ann Arbor. In Ann Arbor, there were Jews all over the place. There was a Jewish presence. . . . We came here, nothing,” Toba Kaplowitz remembered.\textsuperscript{56} Arthur Elstein’s first impressions of East Lansing were entirely about the city’s Christian identity: “The thing that I remember most [about arriving in East Lansing] was how difficult it was to be Jewish and how little the outside world got it. In the 1960s, East Lansing was a quintessentially goyish town.”\textsuperscript{57} And Don and Liz Kaufman both remembered that they planned to stay for only five years: “We thought we were moving to the ends of the earth,” Liz said.\textsuperscript{58} “The homogeneity here, the lack of diversity, the fact that even though this was a college town, there weren’t any places to eat. I mean, it was white bread city and no Jews, except for those who happened to be at MSU, who didn’t live out in Okemos [a suburb of East Lansing], where we did. . . . It was kind of a shock,” Don remembered, adding that they both had wondered: “Oh my God, did we do the right thing?”\textsuperscript{59}

It’s important to note, though, that a number of Jewish academics reported little concern with East Lansing’s lack of diversity at first, and few questions
about their decisions to migrate. Many academics, especially as the job market dried up in the 1970s, were thrilled simply to be employed, and their top priority was to get their research done and to get tenure. Rich Block’s early memories of East Lansing, for example, were that “it seemed like a nice place to live. . . . My focus was on the professional piece and the department was a good place to work . . . people let me do what I wanted to do.”60 “I was happy to have a tenure track job at a major research institution,” Josef Konvitz explained.61 And Emily Tabuteau remembered, “I was delighted and relieved.”62 In these responses, and others, we can see Jews accommodating to a new postwar economy, where upward class mobility was premised on geographic mobility, and the emergence of a “New Class” of information and service professionals promised young Jews exciting careers and national networks that expanded well beyond the urban Jewish neighborhoods of their youths. The promise of satisfying work, congenial colleagues, and a stable, prestigious career was more than enough to justify moving to a city with far fewer theater, art, music or food options than any other city most of the migrants had lived in.63

Unsurprisingly, spouses tended to be more unhappy than academics themselves. Fran Yelon made Steve promise her they would leave in a year.64 Other spouses—all women—did not make quite such drastic demands, but they remembered being lonely, depressed, or frustrated at home with children, without jobs, and without a clear social network, while their husbands worked constantly in order to publish and get tenure. If Rich Block thought East Lansing “seemed like a nice place to live,” for his wife Marcia Horan, “the first five years [in East Lansing] were probably the loneliest of my life. I think I was probably depressed . . . I didn’t like it there at all.”65 Bev Wiener remembered that David “was always at a desk either grading papers or reading something,” and she was responsible for both of their young children. “It was hard because we didn’t know anybody and David was busy with his new job,” she remembered, noting difficulties finding friends and staying home with her children alone. “For me it was a hard first year, it was a lonely year. We didn’t even have a telephone. The city of East Lansing had not expanded its phone service fast enough. . . . I couldn’t wait to be with other adult humans more.”66 The geographic mobility of academia was premised on a breadwinner ethos that brought only one individual (almost always a man at that time) to a university and assumed his spouse would travel gladly and care for his family; compounding matters, in the 1960s and 1970s, MSU had a policy of refusing spouses jobs.67 As a result, women who themselves had trained for positions in education, labor relations, law, or the arts frequently found themselves
unemployed in East Lansing, without a family or social network and often with
the sole responsibility of caring for children.

In these circumstances—lonely for women and pressure-filled for men—
Jewish migrants sought friends of any background. Although many reported
being surprised by or disappointed in the lack of cosmopolitanism, diversity,
and Jewish culture in East Lansing, few said they sought out Jewish networks or
friends at the beginning. To be sure, some had Jewish members of their depart-
ments who reached out to them immediately; they formed close friendships
and social circles that were both Jewish and professional right away. Others,
however, became friends with members of their departments, or with neigh-
bors, who were not Jewish; as women found jobs in the community and put
their children in daycares and schools, they made non-Jewish friends through
those avenues as well. With backgrounds that had made Jewishness a part of
the scenery, rather than an active engagement that was a necessary part of their
lives, most migrants did not seek out Jewish life or Jewish community at the
beginning of their years in East Lansing.

And indeed, there was little Jewish communal life to seek out. As noted
above, there was only one synagogue in town, Shaarey Zedek (SZ)—a far cry
from the multiple synagogues, shops, and restaurants with which most men
and women had grown up. And many professors and their families did not
find SZ in the 1960s and 1970s a hospitable or welcoming environment. It had
begun as a traditional, Orthodox synagogue in 1918, after a number of Eastern
European Jewish immigrant families had arrived in town and established busi-
nesses. In 1938, the synagogue merged with Temple Beth El, a Reform syna-
gogue that had been established years earlier. Shaarey Zedek held both Reform
and traditional services for years; in 1950, it affiliated with the Reform Union
of American Hebrew Congregations, and in 1972, it affiliated with the national
Conservative body, United Synagogue of America.

But it was not really denomination that turned off most migrants. Instead,
it was issues of class, gender, and decorum that concerned them. A number of
academics who migrated to East Lansing in the 1960s viewed Shaarey Zedek
as the province of the wealthy businesspeople of the community, most of them
having been born and raised there. “They were . . . the people who owned
the major Jewish businesses in the metro Lansing area,” remembered Harry
Perlstadt. In 1969, the synagogue moved to a new, expensive, modern build-
ing on Coolidge Road in East Lansing, and the fundraising entailed for that
construction was substantial. The synagogue required dues to belong, and tick-
ets to pray on the High Holy Days. For some academic families, those dues
symbolized the gulf between the wealthy business class of Lansing on one hand and the professors new to the community on the other. Several remembered one of their friends, Walter Kron, insisting that “You shouldn’t have to pay to be a Jew.”\textsuperscript{71} Others found the environment of Shaarey Zedek at the time “too fancy,” or dominated by “moneyed people whose values were different than ours.”\textsuperscript{72} “Shaarey Zedek at that time was very snooty,” Art Seagull remembered, “they looked down on the academics.”\textsuperscript{73}

Gender too played a role in some migrants’ discomfort with Shaarey Zedek. As was typical in Reform and Conservative congregations in the 1960s and 1970s, women could not lead services, read from the Torah or make \textit{aliyah}. For some migrants, this inequality was insupportable; for example, Annette Weinshank was religiously educated, and in the wake of the second wave feminist movement, she sought to lead services.\textsuperscript{74} Traditional voices at Shaarey Zedek rejected that possibility. Moreover, the culture of Shaarey Zedek was structured by gender division; men served as president, while women led the Sisterhood. Women’s roles at the synagogue were auxiliary, dedicated to the kitchen and the gift shop far more than actual leadership. In an era of second wave feminism, young migrants—both men and women—found that culture traditional and stultifying. “Shaarey Zedek was a space in which women served coffee and tea; they ran the kitchen. Shaarey Zedek was not a space where women stood up and said this is what I think.”\textsuperscript{75}

As the above testimonies make clear, however, both gender and class were tied closely to an issue that scholars have identified as central to synagogue participation in the United States: decorum. Elements like “room arrangements, prayer tunes, and their style of praying,” mattered more for young migrants than issues of denomination or theology.\textsuperscript{76} Young migrants, many of whom had been politically active in protests for civil rights and against Vietnam and most of whom came to East Lansing as transplants from larger city environments, where synagogue attendance had been mostly a backdrop for daily life, found the decorum of Shaarey Zedek inhospitable: formal, traditional, hierarchical and stuffy. “I wasn’t going to join a regular synagogue, not me,” Toba Kaplowitz laughed. “I also felt the very limitations of expectations and the traditional stuff, the role of women, there were all sorts of issues. . . . My mindset was: no traditional shul. I’m not even going to give it a chance.”\textsuperscript{77} Art Seagull called Shaarey Zedek “a very formal place . . . They had a rabbi, had a chazan . . . Shaarey Zedek was the kind of place that I knew . . . from back in Newark and it seemed to me very old style, very stultifying, suffocating, you sat here, the rabbi was up here, he told you [what to do].”\textsuperscript{78} “We were in our
20s, and [Shaarey Zedek] seemed so formal,” Fran Yelon remembered.79 These comments all suggested that concerns about decorum—the environment of the sanctuary, the style of the service, the very fact of tradition—were key concerns for Jewish migrants in East Lansing, just as they were for young Jews throughout the United States.

These cultural discomforts with the only significant Jewish institution in East Lansing had lasting and perhaps surprising impact. These men and women—who were mostly uninterested in religion, not particularly interested in seeking out Jewish community, and who were content to let Jewishness be only a silent backdrop to their lives, as it had been for quite some time—wound up constructing several vibrant Jewish institutions of their own in mid-Michigan in the 1960s and 1970s. This development placed East Lansing Jews squarely within contemporary currents of the Jewish counterculture, which was emerging at precisely this moment throughout the country. Independent minyanim and havurot—small lay-led prayer groups—were transforming American Judaism during this era, as young Jews sought to construct Jewish institutions that reflected their own politics and aesthetics.80 At the same time, however, the academics who migrated to East Lansing responded to the Jewish counterculture in a fashion slightly different from Jews in Los Angeles, Boston, or New York. The fact that they were all separated from their natal and extended families and transplanted to an almost entirely non-Jewish environment, with only one other Jewish institution and a tiny Jewish community, meant that their new institutions were not solely designed to identify themselves as countercultural Jews different from establishment Jews. Those institutions also wound up constructing a substitute Jewish family, a viable Jewish identity for their children, and a more intense Jewish institutional life than most migrants had anticipated for themselves.

The first of these institutions was a fleeting and ephemeral one, but it reflected a belief among many Jewish academics and organizational leaders during the 1960s that Judaism needed to be connected to intellectual inquiry to keep young Jews engaged in the community.81 Several Jewish faculty members from the American Thought and Language department in the late 1960s instituted a Friday-night discussion group for Jewish couples in the area—mostly, though not exclusively, faculty couples. Using a model practiced by secular Israelis, members would meet in one another’s homes on Friday nights once a month for coffee and cake, and one person would give a lecture about their work, or about a subject of Jewish interest. “It was also a bit of a social event. . . . It was more about getting together with other Jews on Jewish topics,”
Bev Wiener remembered, noting that it enabled them to make friends with other Jews during their first year in East Lansing. Since a number of these couples had children approaching school age, they began to talk about developing a Hebrew school for them. By 1968, about a half dozen migrant families had established Rishon, a Hebrew school “where kids could learn the letters and learn about the holidays.” The school was determinedly secular, and it was shaped by the needs and proclivities of the new Jewish migrants moving into East Lansing: the founders were “young Jewish families, who were not interested in becoming members of the synagogue . . . but had kind of a secular humanist approach to Judaism [and] wanted to have a Jewish community.”

Rishon held classes for young children at the Hillel house off campus on Sunday mornings. They hired mostly MSU college students to teach, though they also recruited Ken Glickman, who had moved to East Lansing to be an instrumental music teacher at McDonald Middle School, to teach teenagers at David Wiener’s house. While the younger children learned inside the Hillel house, their parents socialized on the porch outside, turning the school into a community: “we would take our children there and we would all bring our New York Times and our coffee and bagels and we would sit around and talk. We wouldn’t actually read, we would sit around and talk to each other. And we really became close to each other,” David Wiener remembered fondly. Soon, members of Rishon began to celebrate the holidays together at one another’s homes, creating services and inventing new rituals. “We made our own Sukkah . . . we would have a Purim celebration together and drink a lot and have fun. The biggest event of the year was the Passover seder. And we would make a big deal about it. We would write our own Haggadah. Some of us would perform. . . . People were really very involved with doing creative things for the Passover seder. It was a lot of fun.” They developed their own ceremonies for b’nai mitzvot. At least seventeen families were members of Rishon in its earliest iteration; perhaps forty to fifty people were members before it ultimately closed in 1977. Rishon served as a significant source of Jewish community and education for migrant families in the East Lansing area. “We felt comfortable with the people; it was a comfortable level of Judaism,” Stan Kaplowitz recalled. And Don Kaufman remembered that in the midst of his and Liz’s shock over the transition to East Lansing, “the department was really our family here, and then gradually, the Rishon group became our family . . . and that made things a lot more comfortable.” Rishon helped migrants to create a Jewish community in East Lansing.
For a few influential members of the Jewish migrant community—especially Arthur and Rochelle Elstein, Lee and Judy Shulman and Don and Annette Weinshank—Rishon’s focus on community and secular humanistic Judaism was not enough, however. Some of these men and women had joined Rishon, but they were not satisfied by its once-a-week secular school or its communal holidays. They believed they needed a more sophisticated religious education and a deeper religious experience, one grounded more in sacred Jewish texts, traditional liturgies, and the religious practices with which they had grown up, even though they were no longer observant Orthodox Jews. At the same time, a group of Shaarey Zedek members (some of whom were MSU faculty who had migrated from elsewhere and others who were not), including Martin Fox, George and Esther Kessler, and Jerry Faverman, had decided that they were unhappy with the synagogue, mostly because of its education for both adults and children, and began making plans to create a new synagogue.89 “Probably the local congregation is weakest in the area of religious education. It has no adult program of any kind and its religious school program is outmoded, with no coherent curriculum or adequate administration, and is sadly underfunded,” wrote Lawrence Alexander, an academic migrant, to the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College in 1970, seeking a rabbi for the new congregation.90

These dissatisfied Shaarey Zedek congregants and Rishon members worked together in 1970 to establish a new congregation, Kehillat Israel. In June 1970, they held an open meeting for Jews in the community to try to recruit potential members—predominantly from the expanding pool of academic migrants, along with a number of other transplanted Jews, some of whom worked as lawyers or professionals for the state.91 By the fall of 1970, KI had written bylaws, attracted at least twenty-seven families as members, and held its first High Holy Day services at a local East Lansing church, with David Fass, a student from the Reform movement’s Hebrew Union College, acting as rabbi. By the middle of 1971, it counted forty-four families as members, and rented space in a former fraternity house from the local Unitarian Universalist church.92 The synagogue relied initially on Rishon as its primary educator for younger children, but established a classroom for children in grades five through eight, with teachers drawn from the MSU graduate student community.93 The congregation also insisted upon the need for adult education in its very first mission statements, and planned to continue the Friday-night discussion group as part of their Shabbat services: “The Friday night service will not ordinarily include a sermon. Instead, following the service . . . for those who wish to participate,
the Rabbi will lead a study or discussion session. The discussion of political and social issues, as well as religious themes, will be encouraged.” The third major Jewish institution created by academic migrants in East Lansing, Congregation Kehillat Israel, thus embraced and then superseded the first two. While Rishon and the Friday night group ultimately dissolved as separate entities, KI still stands after fifty years.

Kehillat Israel was purposefully egalitarian, reflecting migrants’ earlier criticisms of the gender and class hierarchies operating at Shaarey Zedek. KI’s very first documents made clear that gender equality was at the center of the congregation’s rebellious self-definition: “Women will be called to the Torah and will be counted for a minyan,” the “Prospectus for a New Jewish Congregation” read. The synagogue’s first bylaws spelled out membership and obligations in terms that were notably egalitarian for the era: “The unit of membership shall be either the individual or the family, both men and women, sharing alike the same rights, privileges, and obligations of membership.” These documents established female membership and participation at KI two years before the feminist group, Ezrat Nashim, called for the Conservative movement of Judaism to make such changes, five years before women were given ali-yot in Shaarey Zedek’s Reform minyan, and fifteen years before Shaarey Zedek tried to establish an egalitarian minyan for its Conservative services. Kehillat Israel’s finances were similarly designed as a radical break from the control of the local business elite at Shaarey Zedek. All KI members were required to contribute something to the synagogue, but they were not required to give any specific amount, and all financial commitments “shall be held in strict confidence . . . no financial commitment in any amount shall be deemed unacceptable for membership.”

Perhaps most significantly, Kehillat Israel was also self-consciously experimental and participatory, focused on education, community, and self-expression. Its first bylaws proclaimed that the synagogue “shall strive to meet the need of the local Jewish community for a new and different approach” to education and religion, and that it would “provide a wide variety” of activities “premised on a willingness of members to participate and to experiment in order to achieve these ends.” “The overriding goal,” the bylaws concluded, “is an atmosphere in which individuals may explore and develop more meaningful means of Jewish expression together.” In these bylaws, KI congregants reflected the countercultural Jewish moment, even though congregants report that they were unaware of the other havurot and independent synagogues emerging in other cities at the same time.
Although the synagogue hired visiting rabbis at the beginning of its existence, its lack of finances, as well as its emphasis on radical self-expression, its lack of denominational affiliation, and its determined and educated congregation soon defaulted to making it a lay-led service for years. Some academic migrants who had gone to Camp Ramah or Orthodox shuls as children were capable of leading services “at the drop of a hat,” and they worked to train others to do the same. Despite this impressive training (or perhaps because of it), congregants sometimes engaged in “vicious arguments” over seemingly small matters of decorum—how to hold their bodies, for example, for the Cohanim blessing of the congregation during the Yom Kippur service. As Riv-Ellen Prell has suggested, it was these arguments over decorum and aesthetics that were crucial to the countercultural Jewish movement’s understanding of themselves. Just as significantly for the academic migrants of KI, it was in part the lay-led nature of the congregation, the emphasis on personal participation and experimentation, the rancorous argumentation over matters of decorum, and the absence of a rabbi that made their religious experiences far more intense, meaningful and even enjoyable than they ever might have expected their Jewish life would become. “It was such a thrill to have KI, where we asked questions,” Art Seagull remembered, “We were without a rabbi for 18 years, that was terrific . . . that was more fun.” Arthur Elstein noted that he had not grown up going to synagogue regularly and that even at Camp Ramah, prayers had not been the most meaningful part of his experience. It was organizing the minyan at Kehillat Israel after the death of his mother that led him to make that experience part of his life. And even a migrant like Fran Yelon, who attended a Reform synagogue growing up and could not initially read the Hebrew or sing the prayers, explained that the lack of a rabbi at KI was liberating and empowering: “At KI, we were all on our own, with many very knowledgeable people. And that [gave us] a sense of pride.”

To be sure, not all academic migrants joined Kehillat Israel by any means. Determinedly secular members of Rishon refused to join KI, for example, uninterested in the religious experiences it promised. Then, too, there were many secular Jews in East Lansing who resisted organizational affiliation of any kind. Lisa Fine and Emily Tabuteau, like many secular Jews throughout the university, simply had no interest in joining any Jewish organization—Rishon, KI, or SZ. There were also academic migrants who chose to join KI, but then left it to join Shaarey Zedek. Josef and Isa Konvitz joined KI when they arrived in East Lansing in 1973, but they did not make friends with many members and did not feel comfortable at the synagogue. With a family line that featured two famous
rabbis, Josef found the lay-led experience to be chaotic, rather than meaningful, and Isa remembered that the synagogue's politics concerned them when the family returned from a sabbatical in France in the 1980s; like some other academic migrant families, the Konvitzes moved to Shaarey Zedek and helped to change that synagogue's culture and politics. Isa was the first woman to be called for an *aliyah* at the Conservative services in Shaarey Zedek in the 1980s.  

Yet for many Jewish academic migrants, the experience of building Kehillat Israel offered them not simply a chance to express themselves as members of an emerging Jewish counterculture, different from the established Jewish business class in East Lansing. It also allowed them to build a Jewish identity, community and family in a non-Jewish environment hundreds of miles from their nearest family members. “My family [in Brooklyn] didn't do the things that we do in East Lansing, [become] members of a synagogue,” Paul Menchik noted. “Because everybody was Jewish, it was such a homogeneous community. Why join a synagogue? was the attitude. It’s only when you’re in the Midwest, I suppose, and you’re Jewish [that] you want to identify by joining a synagogue. And if I'd stayed in New York . . . I might have stayed a non-member of a synagogue.” Rich Block too compared the Kehillat Israel community in East Lansing with the Chicago Jewish community of his youth, “It’s our community and it’s the community that we’ve made. . . . You go to New York and you walk into a ready-made community. Here you have to make it because it’s not there. . . . I appreciate it a lot more because it’s something I feel like I’ve had a piece in creating and everybody else has a piece in creating. And when I think about growing up, [Jewish community] was always there, but it’s not something I did. This I feel that I had a little piece of creating. Here, everybody has a little piece of creating it. Whatever it is, it’s because we've made it.”

For many secular urban Jews, it wasn’t even their own Jewish identities that were most important; it was those of their children. Both Rishon and KI illustrated a signal dilemma for many secular urban Jews who had moved to East Lansing for MSU. As both Block and Menchik’s quotations suggest, they themselves had Jewish identities formed by the particular circumstances of their urban Jewish neighborhoods: the dense structure of institutions, the presence of extended families nearby, and a wide range and dense concentration of Jewish neighbors and friends. When they were young, they could attend synagogue, or join a youth group, or not, and their understandings of themselves as Jewish were nonetheless embedded in their childhood experiences. But their own children raised in East Lansing would not experience any element of their parents’ Jewish childhoods—indeed, they would probably know
very few or no Jews or Jewish life at all in their own community without some form of organized institutional learning, which migrants felt they had to construct on their own. Many academic migrants discussed their decisions to join Rishon or Kehillat Israel as a product of this realization. “I think the lack of Jewishness we felt once we had a kid,” Toba Kaplowitz remembered. “That was like, ‘Oh my gosh.’ We can manage fine, we thought. But . . . the kids wouldn’t grow up Jewish because they would not only know nothing, they would know no one. . . .”109 Another woman from Los Angeles noted that it was the fact that there was only one other Jewish child in her son’s entire grade at elementary school in East Lansing that led them to join KI and put their children in Hebrew school: “We have often wondered if we’d stayed in [Los Angeles], would we even have joined a synagogue? Would [our kids] even have gone to Hebrew school? Because it’s so much in the air in L.A. . . . If we were just going to Canters and Juniors every weekend to eat, would we have just thought: ‘Oh, they don’t need to know anything.’ . . . It’s partially the fact that we came to this small town that they ended up getting all this Jewish training.”110 Harry Perlstad was perhaps most evocative in describing the differences between his own childhood and that of his children: “I guess I have a Jewish identity. I’ve always known who I was and part of who I was was always Jewish. It’s not that I was terribly religious but I knew I was Jewish. . . . My personality and my identity were established fairly early in life. . . . It was something that was a part of me and I wanted it to be part of [my children].”

And migrant after migrant testified that Rishon and KI provided them with Jewish community and family while they were far from their own natal families and communities. “I knew people outside of KI but they weren’t my closest friends,” Arthur Elstein remembered. “When my wife got sick, . . . we had a conference around our kitchen table in East Lansing and the people around that kitchen table were [people from KI]. When I was in trouble and I needed to figure out what to do or what was my next move, those were the people I talked to. . . . This was a relationship that went far beyond going to shul. It was a community. . . . It did the job.”111

These poignant testimonies suggest that there are different experiences of migration in the twentieth century that American Jewish historians need to attend to. Jewish upward mobility in the years after World War II was frequently premised on geographic mobility—not only to the suburbs or the Sunbelt, but also to college towns like East Lansing, Michigan. Once in those college towns, at least some young Jewish academics and their families participated in the Jewish countercultural movement that was reshaping Judaism in the 1960s and
1970s throughout the United States, but that movement took on very different meaning for men and women hundreds of miles from their homes, families, and Jewish communities in New York and Los Angeles. They not only distinguished themselves from more established Jews in aesthetics and politics, but they created a Jewish community, family and identity in unfamiliar spaces far from home. The Jewish lives they made for themselves and the institutions they built suggest that there is greater richness, diversity, and texture in American Jewish history than has previously been considered.
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